THEOLOGY

VOL. LVIII JANUARY, 1955 No. 415

Editorial

WHEN the Church Assembly in November debated the method of appointing bishops, there appeared to be a desire on the part of several speakers to see responsibility for such appointments more firmly placed than in fact it is at present in ecclesiastical, and indeed in clerical, hands. Our own fear is that the Church is in danger of losing the valuable services that the civil magistrate can render to it in this matter, when as yet there is no need to lose them. In particular, we believe that the Archbishop of Canterbury already has as much influence in the selection of bishops as is wholesome for the Church. We are also apprehensive about the effects of his influence upon them after they have been appointed, and no harm will be done if we tentatively indicate the nature of our misgivings about the latter kind of influence.

Shortly before his death in 1902 Father Dolling contributed an article to *The Pilot* (15 February 1902) on "The Genius of the Church of England", in the course of which he wrote:

> Three great prelates have occupied Augustine's chair in my time, each with special gifts far above the common man, but with one gift pre-eminent that has been fatal to their brethren—the destruction of all individuality on the part of Diocesans. . . . I wonder if is true that there is a bedroom in Lambeth that each Prelate sleeps in on his first visit; that in that room there is a bed which has the power of elongating or compressing each occupant to a certain uniform stature. At any rate, we can see the effect of this process. . . .

The three archbishops to whom he was referring were Tait, Benson and Frederick Temple. If we extend our observations to include the four subsequent occupants of the primatial see—Davidson, Lang, William Temple, and the present Archbishop—we do not think it would be necessary to change what Dolling wrote either with regard to their special gifts or with regard to the effects of their personal ascendancy on the bench of bishops. In fact, we were somewhat surprised to discover that Dolling had made a remark in 1902 which we were ourselves tempted to make fifty years later and which we had supposed had acquired its point only during those fifty years.[1]

There have of course been obvious advantages to the Church in the personal pre-eminence of recent Archbishops of Canterbury. The affection they have inspired in their suffragans has contributed to the unity of the Church and to smoothing out difficulties in administration. The Archbishops themselves are not to be blamed for the ascendancy they have won. Or should we say that they would be blameable only if they had failed to realize its dangers and, in so far as their influence went, had failed to forward the appointment of bishops who would be likely to stand on their own feet and to use

[1] Cp. G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson* (3rd edition), p. xiv.

their own powers of judgment independently? It is not easy to guess how far our recent primates have been culpable in these respects and how far they can be held responsible for that uniformity of episcopal mind and demeanour which is a good deal more apparent now than it was fifty years ago.

The beds at Lambeth are not open to public inspection, and anyhow we do not share Dolling's suspicions about what happens to a new diocesan bishop on the occasion of his first interview with his metropolitan. We should however like to know more about the private bishops' meetings that are periodically held there.[1] Even closer secrecy is maintained about these meetings than about meetings of the cabinet, although, if rumour may be credited, the business transacted at them is less interesting and less important. But just as it is in the cabinet that a prime minister wields influence over his colleagues and new colleagues acquire the proper frame of mind, so it may be with the private meetings of the bishops.

It is extremely difficult to ascertain what has gone on at these meetings in the past, let alone what goes on at present. We do not doubt that there are certain matters about which the bishops as a whole can with benefit to the Church confer in private, for example about how to deal with bogus clergymen or with would-be ordinands who are trying to enter the ministry by the back-door. There may also be critical emergencies which the bishops should consider in private as well as in public. But these matters and these occasions, we suggest, should be kept to a minimum, not only because bishops should not be withdrawn from their dioceses more than is necessary, but also because, when they do debate and decide upon matters of ecclesiastical policy, they should normally do so in public so that the Church as a whole may be rightly informed about the questions at issue and about the grounds of disagreement as well as agreement that may reasonably exist. We know that sometimes subjects have been discussed and decisions reached at these private meetings which ought to have been dealt with in the open. It is each bishop's duty not so much to carry out an agreed episcopal policy as, in the words of Archbishop Ullathorne, to bear "testimony to the traditions, teachings, and customs, of the Church over which he presides", and he should be heard doing this in public. We should like to be sure that there is no danger of the Church's being governed by an episcopal caucus that agrees upon its policy in secret. It is no good trying to commend constitutional episcopacy to non-episcopalians if decisions that should be taken as a result of open consultation between a bishop and the clergy and laity of his diocese are in reality taken by the bishops alone in private and unconstitutional conclave.

The least that might now be permitted is a disclosure of what went on at these private meetings until, say, twenty-five years ago. If an historian were allowed access to the archives at Lambeth he would presumably be able to show how these meetings began, to

[1] They have not invariably been held at Lambeth; see J. G. Lockhart, *Cosmo Gordon Lang*, p. 436.

trace their development, and to enable a discriminating estimate to be made of their justification. So far as we know, no information of this kind has been published anywhere, and the biographers of the archbishops have been almost as reticent as the archbishops themselves. All we can do is to supply a few notes we have made, the chief outcome of which is to reveal how meagre is the available knowledge about what Hensley Henson described as "the meetings of the Bishops which, though extra-legal, had now (1918) become a normal and recognized part of the ecclesiastical system",[1] and of which the present Bishop of London has recently said in these pages that "although not legislative" they "are so important that no bishop would miss them willingly".[2]

In May 1883 Benson arranged that private meetings of the bishops, which had previously been informal, should be held at Lambeth and minutes kept.[3] On 19 June 1887 Lightfoot and Westcott spent the afternoon and evening with Benson and the Archbishop recorded part of their conversation in his diary:

> We discussed the unfortunate result in one most important matter of the happy change in Episcopal activity. The diocesan energies now interfere with every Bishops' meeting, or meeting of Convocation, and leave the Church almost destitute of the opportunity of counsel. The meetings are so short, so full of matters to discuss (ludicrously full), the speechification so lengthy, the unwillingness to commit ourselves so great, and the finalities so hurried, that though some things are carried through not amiss, yet really grave great questions have no hearing. . . . Durham (Lightfoot) is one of the worst absentees. . . . We came to the conclusion that a "Cardinalate" in some form was becoming absolutely necessary. . . .[4]

Although Benson there speaks of "the happy change in Episcopal activity", meaning the energies bishops were devoting to their dioceses, on other occasions he lamented their preoccupation with diocesan business. Thus on 22 June 1889 he wrote:

> The Bishops of England will soon be a name without a meaning. They are Bishops of Dioceses and make an immense fuss about their business and their letters so that people groan over their lamentations about their work—they are good diocesan bishops—but Bishops of England, no. They take no share in public functions or public business even when it most concerns the Church.[5]

Benson attributed the new style of diocesan episcopacy, which would soon be reduced to "Diocesan Inspectorship", to the influence of Samuel Wilberforce, though Wilberforce himself "had far too much sense to be himself the 'new type'. His crime was the misleading of his weak little brothers."[6]

Benson therefore welcomed bishops' meetings as a way of correcting what he called "Diocesanism". We are told that on 20 April 1888 the first "'quiet day' . . . for Bishops of Church of England" was held at Lambeth.[7] On 28 May 1895 Benson's diary contains an account of a meeting of bishops of both provinces held between

[1] *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*, i, 284.
[2] THEOLOGY, June 1954, p. 203.
[3] See Bell, op. cit., p. xiv.
[4] A. C. Benson, *Edward White Benson*, ii, 131.
[5] Ibid., ii, 260.
[6] Ibid., ii, 203; cp. ii, 521.
[7] Ibid., ii, 208.

336364

11 a.m. and 4 p.m. at which the main subjects considered were

> my letter of advice on the present position of Voluntary Schools, a letter to be written by two Archbishops on the position of affairs with respect to the wide desire for Unity, and the Pope's own expression of it in his own way, addressing the English and ignoring the Church; the way in which to treat applications for dispensation from Fasting, which become numerous, and a Programme to greatly shorten Evening Prayer, which found one supporter.[1]

These meetings continued to be held under Archbishop Frederick Temple. For instance, on 21 January 1901 a not too happily conceived "episcopal letter" signed by all the bishops was published in *The Times* newspaper, which had been prepared at a private meeting and which was sent direct to the press. Concerning this, a correspondent of *The Pilot* wrote: "It seems incredible that this letter should have been agreed upon in private meeting, not put forth in Provincial or National Synod";[2] and the editor referred to Bishop Creighton's saying "that, whenever you very much dislike any utterance of the United Episcopate, you may be quite sure that it was assented to by some bishops in order to prevent some very much worse utterance on the part of the others".[3]

The Bishop of Chichester's life of Archbishop Davidson contains an interesting allusion to these bishops' meetings; it has to do with an incident which, Dr Bell says, "gave the Bishops' Meetings both a much more public and a much more formal character than the Archbishop approved".[4] It seems that at a private meeting the bishops had agreed to adopt a certain attitude against the then newly published *English Hymnal*. The Bishop of Durham (Moule) in an open letter to the incumbents of his diocese[5] referred to this episcopal consensus of opinion, and received a sharp reproof for doing so from the Archbishop, who wrote: "I have been trying almost *ad nauseam* to reiterate the necessity of our observing as absolutely confidential everything that passes within these walls on such occasions."[6] It seems to us that, if the bishops were going to adopt an agreed policy with regard to a hymn-book, they should have done so openly, and that this is a case where secrecy was out of place.

Again, we would call attention to a fact which Dr Bell does not mention in his life of Davidson. In February 1927 the Archbishop, in presenting to the Convocations the bishops' Prayer Book revision proposals which had been prepared in private, gave the impression that with the partial exception of the Bishop of Norwich (Pollock) the bishops had been in substantial agreement. It was soon evident that this was not so, and the Bishop of Worcester (E. H. Pearce) wrote to *The Times* newspaper (17 February 1927) asking that the confidential minutes, which had been kept of the bishops' private proceedings, together with the voting figures on matters where opinion

[1] A. C. Benson, *Edward White Benson*, ii, 641.
[2] *The Pilot*, 2 February 1901, p. 147.
[3] Ibid., 26 January 1901, p. 114. [4] *Randall Davidson*, p. 508.
[5] Dr Bell is mistaken in saying that this letter was written to *The Times*; it was reproduced there under "Ecclesiastical Intelligence" on 10 November 1906.
[6] *Randall Davidson*, p. 509.

had been divided, should be made public. The request was not granted. This is a far more serious instance of unjustified secrecy. By such means it will always be possible for the decisions of the bishops to be presented as agreed, when in fact they were not agreed. The Church ought to know the truth.

We wonder how many more cases of this kind there have been. We were not so much cheered up, as we were evidently meant to be, when the Bishop of London lately assured us that "the idea that the Bishops are at sixes and sevens with each other in the administration of their dioceses is one of most amazing untruths ever circulated by unthinking persons. In any case it is the Bishops' Meeting that gives the opportunity for ironing out any difference that may arise".[1] This last expression sounds a little sinister. We should like to see the bishops differing from one another, and agreeing to differ, much more than they do.

There are several large questions concerning episcopal government involved in what we have written, but before an attempt is made to sort them out—and also before any change is made in the method of appointing bishops—we wish to put in a strong plea for the supply of more historical information.

Has "Biblical Theology" Served its Turn?

EACH succeeding age brings with it a change in the theological climate. It is not that new dogmas take the place of old ones, though even this may possibly occur. We find, rather, a shift of emphasis, sometimes so complete as to appear to introduce an altogether new type of Christian consciousness, and sympathetic communication between representatives of the different types then becomes markedly difficult. They do not, in all probability, deny one another's formal doctrine, all of which they may well retain in common. But neither will allow the stress to fall precisely where the other deems it to be necessary. Each may suspect the other of a wilful myopia. The supreme example of the kind is, of course, the divergence between East and West, in which the true cause of schism was not a disputed creed but a deepening cleavage of temper and tradition. The Reformation, on the other hand, provides a signal instance of dogmatic conflict explicitly recognized as such; but the break-up of Western Christendom in the sixteenth century cannot be explained without reference to major historical and cultural changes. Or take, as a further example, the English rational theology of the eighteenth century. Lancelot Andrewes and Samuel Clarke are both Anglicans, but the differences between them are not merely individual and indiosyncratic: in the intervening epoch the theological climate had altered radically.

We have witnessed something similar in kind happen among ourselves in the space of a generation. The consequences have not been spectacular. There has, happily, been no schism, no stress or strain

[1] THEOLOGY, June 1954, p. 207.

in ecclesiastical affairs, no party manœuvring. Nor has there been a liturgical revolution. The passing of liberalism, Catholic as well as Evangelical, signified by a reawakened concern for the theological teaching of the Bible itself, is only the latest illustration of this climatic variation. Fifteen years or so ago it was repeatedly observed that the younger theologians were no longer speaking the same language as their masters. In November 1939 Archbishop Temple wrote of the "sense of divergence" between older and younger men as having become "acute", and considered that the outbreak of war would intensify it.[1] He urged the need of some "appeasement" therefore, and added, with a prescience which time has done much to vindicate, that "if the divergence is unrecognized, its results may be a loss of spiritual fellowship, and a lack of balance in both parties". Very shortly after, Mr (now Dr) E. L. Mascall, as himself a "young" man, expressed the opinion that "the older theologians for the most part appear to the younger to be concerned, if not with a vanished world, at least with a theology that only a vanished world could find relevant".[2] He went on to speak of the new movement, correctly enough, as a "Return to Dogma". "It is concerned", he declared, "not so much with trying to prove by the methods of contemporary secular thought that the Christian religion can make out a good case for itself as with taking the Faith as something revealed by God in Christ and examining how it can be applied to the problems of the present-day world." This, certainly, is an aim which every serious Christian must unreservedly endorse. But those who lead, or who publicize, movements, though their own intentions be wholly sound, do not always succeed in keeping their followers on the right lines, and enthusiasm for the cause leads only too easily to hasty assertions and foolish denials. I venture to think that the great good which "Biblical Theology", in its reorientation of the theological outlook, has unquestionably wrought needs now to be supplemented by renewed attention to the things to which the older generation attached importance but which their successors in the theological schools have been too obviously in the way of forgetting. Moreover, Biblical Theology, as expounded by its less reflective adherents, has too frequently come to be identified with Fundamentalism, which in this reanimated form combines traditional errors with an intellectual sophistication that may appear to some of us as a little less than candid. In fact I believe that the reactionary impulse of Biblical Theology has largely served its turn.

But it has provided a corrective. We have learned, and are still learning, its necessary lesson: for necessary its lesson was. At the end of the first World War it had already become evident, to a few at least, that liberalism was effete.[3] Its presuppositions, which had

[1] THEOLOGY, Vol. XXXIX, No. 233, p. 326.
[2] Ibid., No. 234 (December 1939), p. 407.
[3] The defects of liberalism in its account of the historical origins and nature of Christianity had been demonstrated twenty years previously by Loisy, in his famous reply to Harnack, *L'Évangile et l'Église*, a work which even to-day merits re-perusal.

never been thoroughly scrutinized, were, if not plainly falsified, at any rate sharply challenged, by the revolutionary events which were transforming the world scene. Philosophers and theologians found themselves once more, as Professor Toynbee would say, "living in history". And of this new and disconcerting experience Karl Barth became the prophet. But liberalism—although the Modern Churchmen's Union seems never to have recognized the fact—was also decaying from within, by an intrinsic weakness. For all its broad humanitarianism, it was theologically negative; and it was too much an affair of the study and the lecture-room, placing faith at the disposal of historico-critical research. It failed, in a word, to provide an adequate *religion*. Its humanism, on which it prided itself, lacked roots in human nature, whose complexity and multiform need it failed to understand or measure. English liberalism was an amalgam of Cambridge Platonism, Tillotson, Dr Thomas Arnold and Professor Harnack, and by the nineteen-twenties its intellectual authority, always rather too self-conscious, was recognized to be obsolescent.

A dominant feature of the new outlook in theology was a complete change of attitude towards the Bible. Barth had declared that it is not for us to judge the Scriptures: it is they which judge us. The new point of view "might", in Dr Mascall's words, "be indicated by saying that it takes the Bible not primarily as an historical document which under the critical method can yield important results concerning the factual basis of Christianity, but as the inspired word of God not only describing, but itself being part of, the irruption of the transcendent God into a fallen world". The Bible, it even was claimed, had been resurrected.[1] In effecting this change of view the late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns was, among Anglicans, the principal influence.

Attention has, therefore, been directed, very rightly, to the study of the Bible less in respect of its historical origins than of its religious meaning and authority. But in doing this a number of far-reaching dogmatic assumptions came to be made. I suspect that to-day we are beginning again to feel a little uneasy about certain questions which the liberals saw plainly enough, but left unanswered or answered mistakenly, and which Biblical Theology is too readily content to by-pass. But unless we do attempt to answer them—and the attempt must take us once more into the chilly open spaces of philosophy—the theology of the Bible, which it can never be other than a paramount duty to study, will remain, in the long run, an enigma. It is to be noted, in this regard, that some of our contemporary theologians seem to delight, when expounding the Scriptures, in underlining all that is most remote from, most alien in them to, the presuppositions and ideals of the twentieth century mind. I am far from convinced, however, that the abiding truth of God's self-disclosure is served in this way. Archbishop Temple, referring to the

[1] Cf. *The Resurrection of the Bible*, by G. B. Bentley. I am afraid that much of the author's argument seems to me to illustrate only too clearly the kind of exaggeration for which Biblical Theology may be justly criticized.

theological outlook of the epoch in which he himself grew to maturity, remarked that "the difficulty which many of the younger generation found about it is not that it leads nowhere, but that it starts from a place where they are not standing and to which they cannot get. I am reminded", he continued, "of the undergraduate who said to me in 1911 or 1912, after listening to Bishop Gore: 'I could see that his mind was an awfully jolly merry-go-round, but it never stopped where I was so that I could get on.' "[1] Nothing, I fancy, could more accurately describe the perplexity of an educated man of to-day, who is unable to approach nearer than the fringe of Christianity, when confronted with the ideas and terminology of which our Biblical Theologians make such free use. Of the eschatology of the apostolic age he can make nothing; and talk about "the irruption of the transcendent God into a fallen world" leaves him bewildered and incredulous.

The direction of this post-liberal theology has now shown itself very clearly. It is a theology of Judgment and Redemption rather than of Creation and Incarnation—a character for which it is deeply indebted to Continental Protestantism. In consequence the doctrines of Election and Justification by Faith have, after a long quiescence, reappeared in theological debate. Much attention, too, has been paid to eschatological expectations, though without, one fears, any serious attempt to restate them or to eliminate the confusion which has always vitiated Christian thought about "the Last Things". The very term *eschatology* has acquired a generality and vagueness of usage from which it might with advantage be delivered. That Biblical Theology, however, should appear essentially as a theology of Redemption is as much due to contemporary influences as to New Testament doctrine.[2] It tends, as Temple pointed out, "to sound the prophetic note; it is more ready to admit that much in this evil world is irrational and strictly unintelligible; and it looks to the coming of the Kingdom as a necessary preliminary to the understanding of much that now is".[3] The Johannine emphases, therefore, despite Hoskyns's own important work on the Fourth Gospel, are much less evident in recent thought than their actual place in New Testament teaching would give reason for. The Johannine teaching is essentially "incarnational", and it is the incarnationalist theology characteristic of the idealism or immanentism of half a century ago against which, also, the present-day reaction is turned. The word *immanentism* is now weighted with theological odium. Yet Christian theology is bound to explain as fully as it can the implications of the doctrines of Creation and Incarnation: which means, in particular, that the capacity and scope of man's reason must be acknowledged, not in a spirit of grudging concession, as though with reluctance to see in the rational faculty anything other than the cor-

[1] THEOLOGY, Vol. XXXIX, No. 233 (November 1939), p. 326.

[2] Cf. Bishop Westcott's comment on the contrast between Origen and Augustine: "The one was the interpreter of a universal hope; the other was the interpreter of a secular overthrow" (*Religious Thought in the West*, p. 249).

[3] *Doctrine in the Church of England*, p. 17.

ruptions of the old Adam, but as itself no less than—in Whichcote's phrase—"the candle of the Lord, lighted by God and lighting us to God, *res illuminata illuminans*".[1]

But, as I have suggested, the most apparent objection to an exclusive prepossession with Biblical ideas and language is that they are now no longer, in very great part, intelligible. Do our theologians, accustomed by training and habit to this curiously distinctive terminology, realize how little it conveys to the minds of men to-day? A layman's question, perhaps: but it is, ultimately, to the laity that theology must address itself. A theology which becomes an esoteric science, moving in a world of ideas far removed from the concerns of ordinary men, is a theology in its decadence; the impulse in it to renewal has languished. It is for this reason that one has turned with so much interest to Dr Rudolf Bultmann's recent work. Its barbarous name, Teutonic obscurity, and indeed other faults more positive, should not blind us to the importance—nay, the necessity—of what Bultmann is trying to do. When he declares that "the kerygma is incredible to modern man, for he is convinced that the mythical view of the world is obsolete",[2] he says something which seems to me, as a parish priest, manifestly true. Must acceptance of the gospel involve assumption also of the now absolutely vanished first-century world-view? And if not, what adjustments are requisite? Is it enough merely to furbish up the old theology here and there, where it has most plainly come to pieces? Or is not an effort of thought much more radical and comprehensive called for? The sentence which Temple wrote thirty years ago, in the Preface to *Christus Veritas*—"what is needed is the exposition of the Christian idea of God, life and the world, or, in other words, a Christo-centric metaphysics"—seems to express (to quote his own subsequent words) "a permanent need and the supreme task of theology". But his qualification, that "it is a task of which we now see the impracticability of in anything less than many generations", is, I think, unduly pessimistic. It is a task for every generation to attempt. Who is to say, at any particular date, that *now* is the auspicious moment for the construction of a perdurable theological synthesis? Constructive theological effort, in a Christendom intellectually (and therefore spiritually) alive, is a continuous undertaking. When the times are not ripe—or genius not forthcoming—the result will be ephemeral. No matter: let it pass away. The achievement of real value will abide and make its contribution to the totality of Christian understanding.

Which reflexion brings me to consider the task of a Christian philosophy. At one time the idea that the mere notion of a *Christian philosophy* is one requiring justification would have seemed strange. In our day the rightness, the feasibility even, of that notion has been vigorously impugned. Hard things have been said about the incompetence of human reason. Our rational presuppositions and thought-norms do not, we are told, provide the means by which

[1] *Aphorisms*, 916.
[2] *Kerygma and Myth* (ed. H. W. Bartsch, transl. by R. H. Fuller), p. 3.

revelation is properly apprehended. To put human apriorism before revelation is, according to Barth and his disciples, the fatal temptation of all theology.[1] On the contrary, the order of knowledge must reproduce that of being: we must put first things first in our doctrine, and God precedes man. Philosophies, therefore—so the argument runs—inevitably pervert the gospel; hence the challenge of a *sacrificium intellectus*, which must mean, for the Christian, recognition of the fact that revelation is a mystery—*ein Geheimnis*. How, then, are we to interpret the Scriptures? "The method of theological knowledge"—in Barth's own words—"consists simply in allowing the *object* to determine the thought and terminology. The Word is not subject to human premisses: it is human premisses which are subject to the Word."[2] This type of assertion, with its inherent ambiguities, is best met by a forthright negative. We cannot interpret the Scriptures *without* recourse to the ideas which to us are normal and natural. There must be some kind of mental translation; it may be quite unconscious, and the more misleading on that account. The truth is that the meaning of the Scriptures is not self-evident; every age must discern it as best it can. It is not merely a matter of interpreting specific texts, but rather the whole content of the revelation which the Bible comprises. Herein, then, is the part and use of a philosophy. We cannot dispense with the philosophical prolegomena to religion, or with what F. R. Tennant called philosophical theology; and those who pretend to be able to do so ought rather to confess that their presuppositions are simply unacknowledged and unexamined. When, for example, it is complained of the nineteenth-century theologians that they were "apt to look at the Scriptures through nineteenth-century spectacles and to interpret them in terms of nineteenth-century ideas",[3] we must reply that the nineteenth-century theologians could do no other, any more than could thirteenth-century theologians, or can our twentieth-century theologians. It may even appear, as I think in time it will, that twentieth-century theologians are very especially the victims of circumstance, that they have allowed their judgment of truth to be deflected by the spectacle of human misbehaviour as we have seen it during the last generation or so. The fact of such misbehaviour (although in itself, and apart from the enlarged scope of its consequences, probably no worse than in earlier ages) we must take account of theologically; and it is no doubt true that our grandparents were very prone to overlook or misconceive it. But the philosopher will remember in his meditations God's creativeness and orderly providence, as well as the monotonous commentary of history on man's Fall and its outcome. He will remember, too, that man yet bears within himself the *imago Dei*, and that the achievements of the human spirit are ofttimes as Godlike as its impulses are demonic.

The present separation—amounting indeed to a gulf—between theology and philosophy is to be deplored. It is a phenomenon, how-

[1] See *Die kirchliche Dogmatik*, I. Bd, 2. Teil, p. 4.
[2] *Credo*, p. 159.
[3] R. Cant, in the *Church Quarterly Review*, July–September 1946, p. 161.

ever, for which the philosophers are themselves in large measure to blame. After a brief if brilliant conversion to idealism, English philosophy has reverted, *via* the realism of Moore, Russell, and Broad, to its native and traditional empiricism. Logical positivism, which still appears to dominate the philosophic scene, would confine "positive" knowledge to the natural sciences, which alone enable us to frame true, because meaningful, propositions. In so far as philosophy has any proper task at all it is the analysis of the logical structure of language. Apart from logistic and the study of the nature of scientific induction it has no legitimate function. Indeed Professor Ayer would concur with Dr Barth in affirming, if for very different reasons, that "dead is all metaphysics"; but it would be their sole point of accord, for the propositions with which the theologian deals are quite certainly, on Professor Ayer's principles, not meaningful. The result has been that the study of the philosophical approach to religion and the theological bearings of philosophy—where once was a busy forum of debate—has become an intellectual no-man's-land. It may also be attributed to the practical cause that our embryo theologians are no longer trained in philosophy.

These statements, I am aware, need a little qualification in view of the small Anglican Thomist following. But Thomism, although for the Romanist thinker a sacrosanct discipline, almost itself *de fide*, is unlikely to exercise any really strong appeal for those who distrust a metaphysic prescribed by external authority. Not that Thomism is incapable of making out an impressive case for itself on purely rational grounds, but its dry intellectualism and concepts fashioned in a pre-scientific era tell against it on the twofold count of both science and religion. Of more immediate interest, I suggest, is the current existentialism which, let us remember, has roots in Christian thinking much deeper in the past than Kierkegaard. If, however, to the more metaphysically minded the credentials of existentialism are unacceptable, there is the work, too little known in this country, of Blondel, Laberthonnière, and Le Roy—"Christian philosophers" (especially the first named of them) in as rigorous a sense of the term as may be demanded.[1]

What all who recognize the importance and value of Biblical Theology must, in short, regret is its failure to present in currently intelligible language the meaning of revelation for twentieth-century man. The Biblical imagery, vivid though it is, must be conceptualized—a difficult and delicate task, to be repeated ever and again. But unless it is, a very large section of the educated public will be unable to make intellectual contact with Christianity. It will not do to sneer at the efforts of the apologist. The Church even in the second century of its history found that apologetic was necessary; and the

[1] These writers, associated at first with Modernism, produced much of their work after the 1914–18 war. Among other recent Continental thinkers concerned with the philosophical implications of Christianity I would mention Arnold Reymond and Pierre Thévenaz in Switzerland, Jean Guitton in France, and Paul Ortegat in Belgium. From America the work of Reinhold Niebuhr and Paul Tillich is well known to us.

need for it has never wholly disappeared. In any case, Biblical theology must issue in dogmatic theology, and this in turn cannot disregard the philosophical postulates of faith or the problems of belief—problems which in our age have become increasingly intractable. At the moment, the Biblical theologian and the scientific philosopher do not inhabit the same universe of thought. I believe that the time is approaching for theology in England, and among Anglicans in particular, to undertake a more bracing intellectual adventure, in continuance of a great tradition from Hooker to A. E. Taylor and William Temple, and including among its more recent representatives Quick, Tennant, Webb, Inge, Gore and Illingworth.[1] Among non-Anglicans let us not forget the achievement, also, of such thinkers as von Hügel, Forsyth, Oman, Pringle-Pattison, Fairbairn, and the Cairds. From all these our younger men have much to learn, including (it may be said) how to write a book; it is for them to resume their predecessors' constructive labours at the point where they left off. If the significance of divine revelation transcends even the Scriptures, then theology, under the guiding Spirit of God, is bound to explore it, whithersoever it may lead.

B. M. G. Reardon.

The Didache Re-examined

In 1938 the Church Historical Society published for me a monograph entitled *The Riddle of the Didache*.[2] Prof. E. Peterson of Rome[3] has made allusion to that title in raising a further problem, that of the text of the Didache, and has proceeded to belabour what B. H. Streeter referred to as the "much belaboured Didache".[4] Though it is seventy-one years since Archbishop Bryennios first published the Didache from the Greek MS. which he had discovered ten years before, written in A.D. 1056 by Leo, "notary and sinner", and though the flood of literature which it provoked has almost died away, yet its problems are still discussed and have never been satisfactorily solved, and no discussion of the origins of the Christian Church and its institutions can ignore the work.

The Didache consists of sixteen short chapters, the first six being a code of morals, arranged as the ways of life and death, the latter being very brief and almost perfunctory. Then follows a chapter on baptism; one on fasting and prayer; two on "eucharistia"; three on apostles, prophets, and teachers, only the prophets being adequately discussed; one on the Sunday eucharistia, leading to one on bishops and deacons. The concluding chapter is an apocalypse. The whole is headed "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. Teaching of the Lord to the Gentiles through the twelve Apostles."

[1] Dr C. E. Raven's recent Gifford Lectures (*Natural Religion and Christian Theology*, 2 vols, Cambridge, 1953) are, let us hope, an earnest of things to come. But Dr Raven belongs to Temple's generation.

[2] S.P.C.K., 1938.

[3] *Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana*, xxvii, 1–4, Über einige Probleme der Didache—Überlieferung.

[4] *J. Th. S.*, xxxvii, p. 369.

Besides the Bryennios MS. we have the following authorities for fixing the text of the Didache: a Georgian translation, a Coptic version of parts, a Latin version of the Two Ways, a Greek papyrus fragment. Depending only on these one reasonably trusts the Bryennios MS. as reliable, but Prof. Peterson has raised the problem in a new light by treating the Didache as a member of the family of Church Orders.

Though this was recognized from the beginning, for Funk published a parallel version of the Apostolic Constitutions and their sources, in Bk VII = the Didache,[1] the first problems discussed were the later references to the Didache in Eusebius,[2] Nicephorus, Stichometry and elsewhere. It was evident, too, that there was some relationship between the Didache I–VI and Barnabas XVIII–XX. There were three possibilities, the priority of the Didache, or of Barnabas, or a common derivation from a third source. F. C. Burkitt and R. H. Connolly supported the thesis of Armitage Robinson's Donnellan Lectures[3] and Prof. James Muilenburg's *The Literary Relations of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*,[4] that Barnabas was prior to the Didache. Other solutions were however proposed by other scholars. There are traces of a relationship with Hermas, possibly with Justin Martyr. Serapion may have used the Didache Chapter IX.

The relationship of the Didache to the Scriptures has been considered in many different ways. For example, Sabatier considered the Didache contemporary with the New Testament, and found no references. Kirsopp Lake notes in the margin of the Loeb text a certain number of references, chiefly in the doubtful parts of Chapter I, and in the apocalypse of Chapter XVI. These references are chiefly to Matthew. Explicit references are indeed few, but reminiscences and allusions may be many more. I have elsewhere[5] tabulated these fully, and suggested that the Didache may be a cento of New Testament reminiscences.

If the literary problems of the Didache are still unsolved, the attempts to fix the date and place of the church described have been even more numerous and varied. The suggested dates vary from A.D. *c.* 70 to the Fourth Century (C. Bigg).[6] It has been suggested that the description is that of the contemporary stage of development of the Catholic Church, that of a Church in some remote backwater preserving old forms, or that of a schismatic or heretical Church. Another suggestion is that it is a fictional work, or an archaizing reconstruction. This last solution would raise the problem of the purpose of the work and the source of the materials.

On the face of it we have a Church in which baptism is administered in the threefold name, by immersion in "living" water, or hot

[1] *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, Paderborn, 1905, vol. i, pp. 387 ff.
[2] *H. E.*, iii, xxv, 4.
[3] *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache*, S.P.C.K., 1920.
[4] Published privately at Marburg, Germany, 1929.
[5] *The Riddle*, etc., pp. 88–119.
[6] *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*, S.P.C.K., 1898.

or cold standing water, or by triple affusion, after instruction in ethics, not doctrine, and after a day or two's fast. There are two weekly fast days, Wednesday and Friday, and the Lord's Prayer is said three times daily. There are eucharistic prayers before a meal and thanksgivings "after being filled". The prayers contain no reference to the Crucifixion or Atonement, but refer to God's gift of life. There is prayer for the Parousia. The food is holy. Prophets may pray as they wish. There is a wandering ministry of apostles, prophets and teachers, but only in the prophets is the writer interested. They are not to be tested, and yet rules to distinguish the true from the false are given. They are "your high priests" and are to be given first fruits. The Eucharist or Breaking of the Bread is to be celebrated every Sunday. Malachi's prophecy of a pure offering is applied to this, and it is called a sacrifice. For this bishops and deacons are to be appointed, presbyters are not mentioned. The qualifications of both orders are the same.

At the moment of the Didache's appearance the chief subject of discussion was the origin of the ministry. Hatch had just given his Bampton Lectures, and Lightfoot's excursus in his edition of Philippians was recently published. These accounted for the threefold ministry by the emergence of the monarchical episcopos as a financial officer of Greek origin (Hatch), or as the chairman of the corporate body of episcopoi–presbyteroi (Lightfoot), presbyters being of Hebraic origin. Harnack produced in *Texte und Untersuchungen* a full edition of the Didache, with notes, in a fantastically short time, and found in the Didache the signs of a period when the Church was guided by a unified, spiritually gifted, charismatic ministry, while the local Church was under its primitive corporate institutional government. This last persisted and was strengthened as the spiritual effervescence died away. Traces of this double ministry could be found in the Pauline list of spiritual gifts in 1 Corinthians and Ephesians. B. H. Streeter in *The Primitive Church* elaborated this thesis by pointing to the influence of such a person as the John of 2 and 3 John or Ignatius in pushing forward the evolution of the monarchical episcopate, while R. Sohm pointed to the lack of distinction between the officers, and found presbyters and deacons as equivalent to older and younger ministers.

It was not difficult to confirm the primitive character of the Didache from its ethical, non-doctrinal beginning, its meagre liturgical instructions, and its meal-eucharist without reference to the Atonement. This was seen to resemble the Johannine discourse of John 6 or the non-Pauline tradition. The possible double description of Chapters IX and X and XIV was always a difficulty. Many had noted the apparent non-Pauline course of eucharistic doctrine in the Johannine and Gnostic literature Lietzmann, in *Messe und Herrenmahl*, could make out a theory of a double development—John, Didache, Gnostics on the one side, Paul, Hippolytus, etc. on the other. It was also possible to find many parallels between Jewish prayers and the Didache, which again pointed to a primitive setting for the document.

Moreover, with regard to baptism the use of the threefold name is found as early as Matthew 28, and the rite is very simple, for there is no reference either to the laying on of hands or to unction. The choice of Wednesday and Friday for fast days is not doctrinal, but merely to distinguish Christians from Jews. There is no regulation about the time the fast will cease on those days.

If then the Didache is an accurate picture of a contemporary Church, it will be early and will probably come from a Jewish-Christian area, perhaps from Syria, for there is a reference to corn being sown on the mountains. The Didache was also used later by the Antiochene Apostolic Constitutions, though this key phrase was used by Egyptians, including Serapion. It will either be very early, for monarchical episcopacy was early established in Syria, or it will come from some secluded Church where progress was slow. This will be especially true if it is later than the almost certainly Egyptian Barnabas or Roman Hermas.

To explain the Didache as the description of a contemporary Church and its peculiarities as those of an heretical community is a solution with evident attractions. The difficulties are (*a*) to find a heresy with the peculiarities of the Didache, (*b*) that there is no doctrinal exposition in the Didache and we tend to assume that heresy is a matter of doctrine. The only possibilities would be some Judaizing heresy or some heresy in which the gifts of the Spirit were especially valued. The asceticism of the rules on fasting may also be a peculiarity. These criteria, however, have not appeared conclusive to all, though Hilgenfeld and R. H. Connolly[1] have inclined to a connexion with Montanism, a solution to which I myself incline. It is significant that only the Montanists prolonged the "station days" beyond the ninth hour, but on the other hand the prophets, though honoured, are significantly subject to criticism. There is, moreover, no sign of that irrational ecstasy to be found in the Phrygian prophets.

Any acceptation of the Didache as a picture of a contemporary situation is rendered difficult (*a*) by the curious mixture of development and primitive simplicity in the chapter on baptism, with its discussion of the type of water to be used, and in the chapter on prayer and fasting with its legal regulation of the use of the Lord's Prayer and the two station days, (*b*) by the duplication of rules about the eucharist in Chapters IX and X and XIV, unless the former passage deals with the agape. Its prayers were later used in the eucharist, its peculiar word *κλάσμα* in Hippolytus's agape.

In many ways all of these difficulties recur if one thinks of the Didache as an archaizing reconstruction, fictional in form, or as law-giving in fictional form, as was the case with other Church Orders, for one can generally identify the period or place where the Church Order was current or the reforms needed. J. Vernon Bartlett[2] very confidently ranked the Didache with these Church Orders, finding

[1] *Downside Review*, vol. lv, July 1937.

[2] *Church Life and Church Order during the First Four Centuries*, ed. C. J. Cadoux, Oxford, 1943.

it to be a composite document, not a unity. Prof. E. Peterson has placed the Didache in this group of documents and has noticed how the various editors of these Orders work freely over their sources, modifying, adding, omitting, modernizing. He considers that there is no reason to suspect that the text of the Didache has escaped this treatment. Our MS. is accurately dated. We have no right to assume that it is the authentic primitive text. He examines various passages, in the Two Ways and elsewhere, and finds that difficulties can be elucidated by reference to other authorities for the text. Thus in Chapter VII he holds that a reference to baptismal unction has been omitted to make the present text difficult, while in Chapters IX and X we have not primitive prayers used by the later Egyptian liturgies, but that the Bryennios text makes use of these liturgies. He remarks that only among the Novatians are we told explicitly that there was no baptismal unction. It is a pity that he does not discuss the chapters on the ministry, for if he had found traces of Montanism there it might have been possible to call as evidence Harnack's statement that in certain parts of Asia Minor, after Nicaea, there was a fusion of Montanists and Novatians.

If Prof. Peterson is correct—and one must admit that he has posed a problem which has never been properly faced—then before we can really discuss the date, purpose, etc., of the Didache we must find out the relation between our Bryennios text and that underlying the Apostolic Constitutions Book VII and that Didache referred to by Eusebius as on the verge of the Canon of Scripture. However, whatever our solution of this riddle may be, there is no doubt that criticism of the Didache since 1883 had a great deal to do with the evolution of modern theories of the course of the history of the Primitive Church.

F. E. Vokes.

Revelation and Religion

This first volume of Prof. Farmer's Gifford Lectures[1] has been eagerly awaited, partly because Giffords are always treated with respect, but more especially because Prof. Farmer writes with a more respected and commanding authority than pertains to the greater part of current and fashionable theological literature. There are no rhetorical flourishes, no extravagances, and no lapses into theological jargon. Not that Prof. Farmer insists on using a common word when he can give us one which, for his purposes, he deems better. Indeed, in Chapter IX he gives us "inhistorisation". The notable difference is that he is at pains to tell us how the word is to be understood, and we are not left wondering (as we sometimes are by much current usage of a word like "eschatological") whether it has any meaning at all. The book is full of evidences of that painstaking care, in exposition and elucidation, which mark it off from so many of its contemporaries.

[1] *Revelation and Religion*, by Herbert H. Farmer. Nisbet. 17s. 6d.

It would be misleading to suggest, however, that the importance of the book is to be measured solely in terms of the infelicities it avoids. It sets before us, in the words of the sub-title, "Studies in the theological interpretation of religious types", and it is for these that we have to be grateful. We are given not just annotations in a catalogue of the varieties of religious belief, but interpretations, and interpretations constructed in terms of a clearly enunciated point of view.

> What we are concerned with is the specifically *Christian* theological interpretation of religion, the interpretation of religion, that is to say, from the standpoint of Christian theology, or rather from the standpoint of the distinctive Christian revelation and faith which are the basis of Christian theology. Since the divine self-disclosure in Christ, the Incarnation, is at the centre of the Christian revelation and faith, we might say that what we are interested in is the interpretation of religion from the standpoint of the Incarnation.

A statement of intention so carefully and, one might even say, so gently written is not likely to attract the attention it deserves. But it proclaims a principle of importance and its defence constitutes the first part of the book. Indeed, the whole course of Prof. Farmer's argument, and the conclusions to which he is driven, can scarcely be appreciated unless we keep this principle constantly in mind.

There are probably several reactions which this approach to the interpretation of religion will call forth. On the one hand the proposal to examine and interpret religious types from a distinctively Christian point of view may look very much like what some Christian writers in the field of comparative religion have been doing for years. Students were assured, often at the beginning and end of each chapter, of the "superiority" of Christianity. Obscurities and curiosities in, say, the Vedas or the Sutras were treated almost as self-evident examples of the inferiority of the faiths they represented. One cannot say that the method did not serve the purposes of theological teachers whose intent was not so much to educate as to protect their Christian students against the contagion of any non-Christian religious notions. Perhaps it did. But it was not long before less cautious students were proclaiming the ideals of Objectivity and Impartiality, and suggesting that to do comparative religion in the old way was not only unscholarly but was even tantamount to cheating. There may have been a touch of *naïveté* in this protest, but it aimed at honesty and was certainly not, in itself, unwholesome.

Nowadays, we are led to suppose, there is a more sophisticated version of the older approach, one so often repeated and implied that it has become almost axiomatic and is therefore never scrutinized. All inquiries, so the story goes, and even scientific ones, are bound to be "subjective"; that is, they are bound to rest upon certain basic, unexamined presuppositions. Therefore theologians need not be apologetic when they yield to that inevitable subjectivity which is the lot of everyone. From these curious reasonings there has, in practice, emerged a subtle and insidious "principle". It might be called The Principle of the Parity of Presuppositions. If there is in fact a

class of statements or principles of which it is just to say, "To state is to refute", this must surely qualify for inclusion. For if we can admit no check upon subjectivity, no measure of objective control upon *every* sort of inquiry or speculation, then, literally, all things are permissible and we shall no longer have any use for such words as True and False. No doubt the "principle" has had an unhappily "liberating" effect upon some theological intelligences. But we cannot doubt that in so far as it gains ascendancy the things which theologians say will be taken with decreasing seriousness.

These two attitudes, the older and the newer, are worth describing if only because Prof. Farmer's program could, superficially, appear congenial to one or other of them. It is in fact most emphatically not so. The grounds of his Christian interpretation of religion are far more secure than any undefended assumption about the superiority of Christianity or any sophistical notion of the parity of presuppositions. He is intensely aware of both the necessity and the difficulty of providing some "objective" check upon theological interpretation. But he is not afraid to make his own position clear and then to look at all the facts in the light of what he takes to be certainly true.

Chapter III is called, "The normative concept of religion as defined by Christian worship", and it is here that we can see some of the foundations of the method which informs the whole book. He elects to isolate a normative concept of religion in so far as one is revealed in the empirical examination of Christian worship. This is of course a highly selective procedure, and Prof. Farmer does not enter upon it without first looking at other possible procedures which might be open to him. He recommends his own choice, in spite of difficulties and possible limitations, because he feels that it can provide a concrete basis of interpretation, grounded at least partly upon observable data, and capable of allowing a coherent and comprehensive account of the many varieties of religious belief and practice. It might be said that a "normative concept" of religion drawn otherwise than from Christian worship could serve equally well, but henceforth no other course can be lightly undertaken before Prof. Farmer's arguments are carefully considered.

What does the concept amount to? Prof. Farmer lists (pp. 78 f.) seven qualities or characteristics which he finds integral to it. Each has to do with a mode or quality of the Christian worshipper's "apprehension of God". God is apprehended as (1) "ontologically other"; (2) "axiologically other"; (3) "personal"; (4) as "asking all"; (5) as "giving all"; (6) as "intimately present and active within the worshipper's own being"; and (7) "pervading the whole awareness" there is a certain "feeling tone". The subsequent interpretations of religious types are carried out by constant reference to these seven qualities. It is significant that Prof. Farmer looks to the justification of this "normative concept" in the content of the interpretations themselves. *It* is right, he nearly says, if *they* are judged to be right.

After reading Prof. Farmer's case for this particular "description", few will be able to offer substantial criticism. The noteworthy thing is that in his quest for a normative concept of religion he goes not to

theology but to Christian worship. (On this score, one would like to say much more about his masterly and profound comments on Holy Communion, pp. 61 ff.) When we speak of the *empirical* nature of his study (keeping in mind, as does Prof. Farmer, the work of John Oman) it is this to which we refer. In the first instance each of these seven elements is not a theological but an observably-religious element. Prof. Farmer is well aware of the difficulties and even the ambiguities which this may involve. To point them out here in a different way is only to suggest that a profitable reading of *Revelation and Religion* will bring them before any diligent reader's attention. To begin, it is not a simple matter to lay one's hands upon the "essence" of Christian worship (nor for that matter, I suppose, of Buddhist or Islamic worship). We know the rites and ceremonies, the words and actions, but only a very little experience of a Christian congregation is enough to convince us of the infinite varieties of "worship" which in fact go on under the same roof, or before the same altar, at the same time. Hence some will say, "Whose example are we to follow, which standard is the right one?" And the theologians will reply, "That is what we are here for, no matter how empirically-minded you think you are or may wish to be." And who, then, is to arbitrate between the theologians on the matter of the "essence" of worship? Most of us who will read Prof. Farmer would hesitate to submit the case to a Quaker or a Roman Catholic. But why? For empirical reasons?

At this point some might be willing to appeal to a philosopher, though equally such an appeal might be thought a dangerous, indeed a desperate, choice. But a philosopher could hardly resist pointing out that the normative concept which Prof. Farmer adduces under seven heads has certain features which go considerably beyond anything which we can *observe* in actual Christian worship. Notably, it is hard to see how we could, without theological and metaphysical presuppositions, speak of our apprehension of God as One who is "ontologically and axiologically Other". When we use such terms we have already embarked upon "interpretation" and have left simple observation far behind. Furthermore, it is unlikely that any amount of further observation could settle a *dispute* about this interpretation. This may be the crux of the difficulty which arises when we bring together Revelation and Reason. For reasons which he sets out at length Prof. Farmer does not, in this volume, attempt to make a case for the original theological (and also metaphysical) commitment which is necessary before we can be at ease with a Christian interpretation of religion. Those who want to know how he would make such a case can read, to their great benefit, his earlier book, *Towards Belief in God.*

The *utility* of Prof. Farmer's analysis, quite apart from its ultimate justification, is more than fully demonstrated in the several interpretations he offers. His discussions of primitive religion, of the religion of "absolute dependence" of Ideal Values, of Introversion, of Obligation, of Eudaemonism—it is in these that we see how his original analysis provides an eminently workable analytic tool. And so too

with his account of elements of a Corporate and Dynamic nature, and of those of Withdrawal, Fulfilment, and Unification in religion. It would be foolhardy to try to summarize them here. But at every point we are aware of the immense sympathy and understanding which Prof. Farmer brings to bear, even upon those "religious types" which he is least disposed to admire. We see how a lack of balance between the seven qualities he finds ideally embodied in Christian worship leads to perversion or distortion in the religion of persons and communities.

There are many other excellent things in this book which a review can only briefly mention: the illuminating discussion of "Natural theology and Christian philosophy" (Chapter I), and his quietly devastating critique of Brunner's strictures upon any "comparative" study of Christianity and other religions. In places like these, as indeed throughout the book, Prof. Farmer shows us again that he stands in what surely we must now regard as a great tradition of British theology. It is the tradition of those who, while maintaining the central Christian affirmations, realize the necessity of some empirical grounding for theological speculation. In these days, when philosophers are recovering and deepening their understanding of the empirical tradition, it is ironic that so few theologians have paid any attention to the rich resources which lie at hand. One can hope that with the publication of these Giffords we may begin to see the turning of the tide.

H. E. Root.

An Ordination Address[1]

1 Cor. 1. 9. "God is faithful, through whom ye were called into the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord."

1 Tim. 2. 13. "If we are faithless, he abideth faithful; for he cannot deny himself."

An occasion when a young man receives his first commission in the Christian ministry within the community in which he has more recently prepared for it, is one on which a sermon, but for the rubrical direction that there shall be one, might be thought superfluous. I have quoted two New Testament texts, not in order to expound them, nor yet as an irrelevant preface to the little I wish to say; but because "the fellowship of Jesus Christ our Lord" is, I think, at once the all-important and the simplest statement of the ideal of the Church, while the abiding faithfulness of God is certainly by far the most essential of faith's convictions, as well for all of us as for anyone called to the Christian ministry, no less in its possible successes (as men judge) as in its inevitable disappointments, frustrations, and trials.

The distinctively Christian Church began as the fellowship of

[1] In the chapel of Westcott House, Cambridge.

Jesus Christ. The loveliest of the Easter day narratives tells of two disciples walking together away from Jerusalem. They had heard reports of women of their company that they had seen a vision of angels, who said Jesus was alive. These astonished them, but plainly carried no conviction. They knew that they had followed him as Messiah, but instead of receiving a kingdom, as they conceived it, he had been crucified. "And they communed with each other of all these things which had happened." And as they talked, the risen presence of Christ was with them, concealed from visual recognition, yet a little later made known to them in the breaking of bread.

In this story there is already a passing from the ministry of Jesus on earth to that of the record of the Christian Church, though as yet there was nothing of the visible fabric or organization by which we now recognize a Christian Church. But in two men talking of Christ, his kingdom, and their hope that it was he who should redeem, the heart and root of the matter were already in being. And if the Church is ever so diverted from these themes as to give *first* place to any others, it loses its distinctiveness as Christian in proportion as it does so.

Many of us here this morning know that it has been through the revealing grace of spiritual fellowship in the common discipleship of Jesus in his Church that our friend, now to be ordained to his ministry, has been led to this conclusion of his pilgrimage, which is also a new beginning.

Some, we know, and among them the ablest and most sincere, feel it is impossible to harmonize knowledge of the natural world, and what seem to them the inevitable inferences therefrom, with what they suppose Christian faith and belief to require. They see in the apparently morally indifferent order of Nature only an unchanging fate and a dumb necessity: they cannot regard it as the fitting expression of a Divine will with whom is no variableness nor shadow that is cast by turning, every happening of whose Providence, whether the outward event be dark or bright, a Divine grace can enable a man to turn into an occasion of spiritual victory. So they turn away from the Christian ministry.

Others do not feel the difficulty; or, if they do, not acutely enough to disturb their purpose. A serene and untroubled faith can be very inspiring; but experience convinces one that what is often honoured as untroubled faith owes its sincerity rather to an absence of reflection than to profundity of insight.

There is, however, a third group. These feel the difficulty acutely, but are also determined to grapple with it in the strong if not untroubled faith that, however painful and costly the struggle may be, the ultimate gain, alike to the Church and to themselves, will far outweigh the cost. It is to this group that this morning's candidate for the diaconate belongs; and we can be thankful that he is not entering the Christian ministry seen only in the transfiguring disguise of pious convention.

We, his friends, wish and, as we are given grace, will pray that the gifts with which he is generously endowed will henceforth be used

faithfully in the cause to which he now comes to pledge them, with a rightly directed life and with all his earnestness. For, as a great teacher in this university so often emphasized, no man can even sincerely seek the Highest with less than his best endeavour; and he must seek it with conscientiousness, for none can approach the Holiest except by following the highest that he knows; with penitence, for no fellowship with the Holiest is possible if we cherish anything with which he may not dwell; and with humility, for none can understand a gospel whose heart is that the love of heaven condescends to the lowliest on earth, if in his own heart there is pride towards either God or man.

And you . . . so far as you can live in this spirit by that grace which is never denied to those who truly seek it, though you would not be human were you never to experience misgivings and were not sometime afraid, yet put your whole trust in him who is faithful, who remains faithful though we may be faithless, who will ever have you in his gracious keeping and preserve you in his love.

J. S. Bezzant.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. B. M. G. Reardon is Rector of Kelly, Lifton, Devon.

The Rev. F. E. Vokes is Rector of Forncett St Peter, Norwich.

The Rev. H. E. Root is a Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

The Rev. J. S. Bezzant is Fellow and Dean of St John's College, Cambridge.

CORRESPONDENCE

"A MODERN DEFENCE OF INFALLIBILITY"

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Though one tends in the course of religious controversy to lose in theology and gain in odium, I should like if I may to attempt a brief reply to Dr Hanson's reply to Abbot Butler's reply to Mr Woodhouse's "Salmon".

Those of my persuasion can have no quarrel with your able and learned reviewer when he protests that "Christian doctrine has developed, but *revelation* has not"; and of course the Church's definitions do not "make" what is defined "revelation". Surely we are agreed that it is for the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to apprehend what has been revealed. to appreciate the Scriptural evidence and to draw the right conclusions from it.

Dr Hanson and I may differ as to whether there is in fact Scriptural evidence for "the dogmas of 1854, 1870, and 1950", but it is one thing to deny our interpretation of, say, the "Petrine texts", and another to deny that we affirm the necessity of "control" by the Scriptural evidence. This necessity we do unequivocally affirm; and

I think Dr Hanson has been too ready to conclude, from what Abbot Butler says on page 104 of his book, that "in order to prove the truth of any recent Roman dogma, all that Roman Catholic theologians need is the concession that 'the Scriptural evidence is not demonstrably inconsistent with the Catholic belief' ". As the context shows, the Abbot is trying to appeal to the man who cannot yet see what we see in Matthew 16. 17–19, to admit *at least* that "the Scriptural evidence is not demonstrably inconsistent with the Catholic belief". An Anglican might similarly invite a Baptist to begin by allowing that "the Scriptural evidence" concerning Holy Baptism "is not demonstrably inconsistent with the Anglican belief". This, moreover, is all that the Anglican will himself "need", from the critical point of view, when he gives his assent to the interpretation the Church he believes in puts on the matter. *Mutatis mutandis* this seems to me to have been also what Abbot Butler meant.

When therefore Dr Hanson alleges that the Marian and Petrine definitions "do not even profess to be based on purely Scriptural evidence", I must distinguish: that we claim these doctrines to be other than truly and positively in accordance with Scripture, I deny; that it is in the light of Tradition that we claim to see them as such, I allow. Let me extend this second limb: I mean that because "*purely* Scriptural evidence" is often indecisive, and because Tradition may supply the decisive evidence, we claim that, in the light of this, these doctrines express what the Scriptures really imply; or, if Dr Hanson prefers it, these doctrines express what is really implied in the formulated belief of the Apostolic Church, in so far as we know this from the evidence of the New Testament. Whether or not this evidence is "to all intents and purposes" complete, it is neither a complete commentary on itself nor does it settle entirely the question of the implication of words and acts recorded. Dr Hanson hopes that in striking at Tradition he will see Giant Pope come toppling with it. Has he considered what else will topple? In the words of Dr L. S. Thornton, Tradition "is not a wall separating persons from their God, but an environment within which they receive the living word"; it is nothing else indeed but the Church's living of the "revelation" through the centuries. The "living mind" of the Church is also the mind of the living Church.

As a *donnée* Tradition rather unites than divides representative Anglican, Orthodox, and Roman theologians. In essaying some middle path between the Bible Only and the Bible and Tradition, may it not be that Dr Hanson is himself pursuing a "will-o'-the-wisp"?

Yours faithfully,

H. D. Hanshell, S.J.

Beaumont College.

Dr Hanson writes:

"Fr Hanshell certainly deserves a reply to his courteous and considered letter about my article on Infallibility. I was not, however, striking at Tradition as such, but at (to quote the words of my article, p. 382) 'The theory of an original, continuous, authentic,

oral tradition of doctrine from which can be supplemented the data provided by the Bible and which is itself independent of the Bible'. I do not believe in 'the Bible only' as the Christian's rule of faith, but in the Bible as interpreted by the Church. But for that interpretation the Church has no reliable independent tradition of oral instruction deriving from our Lord and his Apostles, but only the guidance of the Holy Spirit and the rules of logic and common sense, the two agencies that have in fact produced the classical pronouncements of the Church about the meaning of the Bible (the Nicene Creed, the Chalcedonian Formula, etc.). After all, even if there were a tradition in existence such as that whose existence I deny, it might as readily be asked, 'But how do you interpret that tradition?' and the quest for another original independent tradition to interpret that tradition begun. The alternative, *either* the Roman Catholic theory of tradition *or* the Bible only left to speak for itself, is a false one, both logically and historically. The Fathers in fact supply us with a third alternative, that the Bible should be interpreted according to the way that it has always been interpreted by the main body of Christian thought and practice. This certainly is interpreting it 'within a tradition' and in accordance with a continuous current of meditation and devotion, but these do not owe their origin to any source of doctrine deriving independently of the Bible from our Lord or his Apostles, but to the Holy Spirit acting upon the minds of men and upon the situations, intellectual, political, economic, and psychological, in which the Church from age to age has found itself. I have read statements by some Roman Catholic theologians which seemed to approximate to this position and give hope of a better understanding between us and them on this subject, but the recently enunciated dogma of 1950 appears to contradict this position so grotesquely as to leave little hope of finding a common ground between the two positions.

"The subject of Infant Baptism adduced by Fr Hanshell as an example does not seem to me to illustrate his point at all satisfactorily. While all Anglicans would certainly hold that this custom 'is not demonstrably inconsistent with' the Scriptural evidence, very few would argue that it is a command derived directly from our Lord himself independently of his commands recorded in Scripture, and absolutely none would hold that having been approved and practised by the Church it is thereby discovered to be a constituent element of Christian revelation. But this (with far less historical evidence to support him) is what Abbot Butler appears to me to be doing in the case of the corporeal assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the other dogmas in dispute. Anglicans would claim that Infant Baptism has from a very early period been practised by the Church and is quite consistent with Scriptural doctrine; they do not think it necessary to add the dubious historical statement that the Church has had an independent command from our Lord to do this; they believe that in this custom the Church has been guided by the Holy Spirit. There in a sentence is the Anglican doctrine of tradition."

MINNEAPOLIS AND EVANSTON

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Those of us who had the privilege of being participants in the two gatherings at Minneapolis and Evanston will have read with great admiration the excellent interpretation of their significance in your November issue by Bishop Geoffrey Allen. His comments on the eirenic character of the Anglican Congress, his assertion that we said more constructive things about Christian Hope at Evanston when we were not dealing with the Main Theme than we did when we were, and his recognition of the ambivalent character of the Assembly (there were times when one felt the proper political parallel would be a session of the House of Commons in Harringay Arena), are all very much to the point.

There is, however, one contrast between the two conferences which I believe Anglicans ought to lay seriously to heart and to which I should like to call attention. Looking back on Evanston, one finds lingering in the mind the realization that many of the searching and prophetic utterances which the participants were privileged to hear came from men and women of Africa and the East: Dr D. T. Niles of Ceylon on Evangelism; Dr Charles Malik of Lebanon, Rev. P. K. Dagadu of the Gold Coast and Mrs Rena Karefa-Smart, also of West Africa, on the deep intellectual, social, and spiritual currents that are carrying the peoples of Asia and Africa away from traditional anchorages to new and uncharted seas; Dr Rajah B. Manikam of India on the ways in which the Christian Church is, or is not, adapting itself to the rapidly changing cultural situation.

African and Asiatic Church leaders spoke with deep insight on these matters—but the fact Anglicans have to face is that those who searched the depths were not members of our Communion. Leadership in the younger Anglican churches, it appeared, lags behind the leadership of other churches in Africa and the East, and this fact was borne out by the balance of things at Minneapolis.

It is true that two fine addresses by representatives of the younger churches, Bishop Howells of Lagos and Bishop de Mel of Kurunagala, Ceylon, were given at the great missionary demonstration there. But in the Congress itself there was only one non-white speaker on the program, the Bishop of Liberia, and in the plenary discussion sessions almost all the debating was done by Anglo-Saxons. The leaders of the younger churches were conspicuous by their silence.

I say this in no spirit of personal criticism. But I suggest that it reflects critically on the policies hitherto prevailing for the training of national leadership, and I believe it makes all the more urgent the task of training that leadership *now*, lest we find in coming days that the Anglican Communion has missed the tide.

Yours sincerely,

C. KENNETH SANSBURY.

ST AUGUSTINE'S COLLEGE,
CANTERBURY.

PUTTING MR QUIN IN HIS PLACE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I will try to reply to Mr Carey's letter in your December issue by taking, in order, as far as this is possible, the words in it which might be underlined or italicized.

Universal. As Chillingworth himself said in 1642, "Episcopal government is acknowledged to have been universally received in the church presently (i.e. immediately) after the apostles' time." (Memorandum quoted by Mason.) But actually I got the word from F. D. Maurice (*Kingdom of Christ*, Pt II, ch. 2. 2). I do not suppose there are any bishops in Mars. Mr Carey, it would seem, will not suffer a Quaker to live. That I would, he might see did his sensitivity permit him to read my article again.

Protestant. Here I have erred most foolishly, in the typically Protestant way of protesting against one error and falling into a worse one. (Chillingworth himself, I think in one instance, and his contemporaries, including his Godfather Laud, used Protestant as meaning Church of England.) Here I am ready to receive correction.

Scripture interpreted by Catholic written tradition. These words are Chillingworth's (5. 82) as Mr Carey will see if he will extend his reading, or his attention, beyond the Preface of the work for which he professes such admiration. Let him read also 2. 27; and 2. 89, "Though we are ready to receive both Scripture and the sense of Scripture upon the authority of original tradition, yet we receive neither the one nor the other upon the authority of your church."

Bewildering. After this Chillingworth suggests (2. 144) that "to them that have Scripture and believe it, tradition is unnecessary". Had I made two such contrary statements (as I fear I would), Mr Carey would undoubtedly pronounce it "bewildering".

Yours faithfully,

NARRAGHMORE, CO. KILDARE. COSSLETT QUIN.

THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Dr Mascall asserts in your November issue that the basis of the masculinity of the historic priesthood is the fact that the Word became man as a male individual. But if the selection of priests is to be determined by a consideration of the individual characteristics possessed by the human nature of Christ as a necessary consequence of the particularity of the Incarnation, we might equally well, on the face of it, argue that since the Word became man as a Jewish individual the Christian priesthood should be Jewish by birth. (The distinction between Jew and Gentile was to the Biblical writers of no less fundamental importance than the distinction between male and female.) Presumably the answer to this is that since Christ be-

came man as a Jew because he was to be in himself the true Israel, and since all members of the Church, Jewish and Gentile alike, are members of the new Israel, human participation in the priestly functions of the Incarnate Word is possible for both Jews and Gentiles. But similarly, since the Word became flesh as a male individual because this is congruous with his nature as the Image of God (in man's fallen state only male humanity is said to be in the image of God, 1 Cor. 11. 7), and since in the Church both men and women are restored in the image, human participation in the functions of Christ should be possible for both men and women.

It is not clear what is meant by the exaltation of both sexes in different ways as a result of the Incarnation. The emphasis in the New Testament seems to lie rather on the condescension and humiliation of the Son of God in taking upon himself the likeness of sinful flesh than upon the dignifying of male human nature. The exaltation of human nature is a consequence of the Resurrection and Ascension, and in that exaltation both men and women share as a result of their Baptism. The Virgin Mary is not termed exalted, but blessed, and her blessedness does not consist in the physical fact of her maternity, but in the fact that she hears the word of God and keeps it (Lk. 11. 27–28). This blessedness is not confined to the female sex.

Finally Dr Mascall suggests that we should derive our idea of the function of women in the Church from a doctrine of the Virgin Mary. But even if it is possible to do this, it is not necessarily an argument against ordaining women priests. Mary was the human instrument by which the Word became flesh and gave himself to men as the bread of life. He still gives himself to men in the same fashion in the preaching of the word and in the Eucharist. Would it not therefore be permissible for a woman to preach the word and consecrate the eucharistic elements?

Yours faithfully,
M. E. Thrall.

51, Sandpit Lane,
St Albans.

BOOK REVIEWS

1 Peter: A Paschal Liturgy. By F. L. Cross Mowbray. 3s. 6d.

In 1951, H. Preisker brought out the third edition of Windisch's great commentary on the Catholic Epistles (in Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum N.T.*), leaving the text of his predecessor's work untouched and adding his own contributions in a series of new sections at the end of the book. He offered a new analysis of 1 Peter, based on the general view of it as "das älteste Dokument eines urchristliches Gottesdienst" (p. 157), the product of a number of hands which he professed to detect through indications of stylistic differences. This was a *Zersplitterungshypothese* with a vengeance. Dr Cross has arrived, it would seem independently, at a similar general view of the Epistle, but he finds it unnecessary to postulate a multiple

authorship. He proposes to look upon it as "the Celebrant's part for the Paschal Vigil" (p. 37), and suggests that "it partakes of the nature of both a homily and a liturgy". In this form, it must be said, the hypothesis is much more palatable and is likely to win more serious attention.

The general association of the Epistle with the sacrament of baptism has been recognized by many recent critics and commentators; in my own commentary it is worked out in a verse by verse exegesis. Preisker and Cross are agreed in postulating that it is written around the actual administration of the rite, which takes place immediately following verse 21 of the first chapter; the following section (vv. 22–25) is addressed to those who have just been baptized; Cross gives it the sub-title, "The Bishop's Welcome of the Newly Baptized".

To this Cross adds the new and striking suggestion that "what we have in 1 Peter is not any 'ordinary' Baptism . . . , but the Baptismal rite of Easter, the most solemn act of liturgical worship in the year" (p. 38). This conjecture seems to have been inspired in the first instance by the observation that the recurrent references to *sufferings* in the Epistle do not imply that persecution is raging or imminent; rather, "it seems as if the writer of 1 Peter has used the word πάσχω, in relation to the sufferings of Christ and those which Christians have to bear, as a sort of Ariadne thread for his whole work" (p. 14). He then calls attention to the wide acceptance, among the early Greek Fathers, of the notion that Pascha and πάσχω were etymologically one, and the use of this fancied connexion as a theme of Easter preaching (Melito, Hippolytus, Irenaeus, *et al.*). He notes further that though suffering is the theme, the tone of the work is not sombre but joyous; and he remarks, "Now the coexistence of joy and suffering is precisely the dominant note in the ethos of Easter" (p. 24). But he is finally convinced of the valdity of his hypothesis by its relation to the Baptismal Rite in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, and on the strength of the parallels here he ventures to place the Consecration of the Eucharist and the communion of the newly baptized immediately after 1 Peter 2. 10.

Even if we are not so certain as Dr Cross that Dom Gregory Dix was right in treating the rites of the *Apostolic Tradition* as proper to Easter (p. 9), we cannot fail to see that the parallels with 1 Peter are significant, and we are bound to wish that the learned patristic scholar had put us even further into his debt by offering us his own examination of them instead of leaving us to follow up his hints at our leisure. At first sight, they would seem to strengthen the case for a second-century dating of the Epistle. Further, it seems strange that after recognizing that the play πασχα-πασχω "is clearly possible only in Greek (n. 6, p. 45), and taking this as evidence that Melito's *Homily on the Passion* was written in Greek, he should fail to see that this is equally decisive as indicating that 1 Peter is the work of a Greek (cf. also his reference to Origen's criticism of this etymology, "that any Jew to whom a Christian happened to propound it would count him a poor philologist" [p. 16]). Finally, it should be remarked

that Cross ends his analysis with 4. 11 and expresses uncertainty about the purpose of the remainder of the Epistle, without remarking that at this point the references to sufferings cease to be general and semi-formal, and clearly imply the actual incidence of persecution.

F. W. Beare.

Trinity College, Toronto.

Congregationalism: A Restatement. By Daniel Jenkins. Faber. 10s. 6d.

Mr Jenkins' latest work should give considerable pleasure to readers of Theology, for it is an analysis of the life of his denomination from a point of view not unlike that which characterizes many of the Anglicans who discuss contemporary Anglicanism for us in Theology, executed in an ecumenical temper and with a sense of humour. Not of course that it is everyone's cup of tea: "Anglo-Catholic writers, avid for atrocity stories" (p. 95) may not relish this description of themselves, or such passages as the following: "It is not hard for the Guards officer and the distinguished novelist and the artistic peeress to hear Mass in the same church as the Irish labourer and the elementary schoolteacher's wife and the secretary of the funeral club, if that is their sole association. It becomes more complicated if they are also expected to attend church meetings and serve teas at church social gatherings together and send their children to the same Sunday school" (p. 45).

Anglicans are likely to find of special interest the honest picture of Congregationalism in the chapters "What is Congregationalism Like?" and "Manners and Morals". Our ideas about the feel of other denominations are often hazy and erroneous. Anglicans may reasonably wish for as honest and realistic an account of their own Church to supplement or supplant the conventional books. This is not academic sociology or social history but it is most suggestive and useful; and it is of course a part of the study of the "non-theological factors" in Christian disunity.

Secondly, those of us who are, as has been said, "busily engaged in taking Congregationalism into the Church of England" (an enterprise Mr Jenkins acknowledged more than once) by way of the Parish Meeting and the like, may profit from a study of the discussion of the Church Meeting on pp. 95 f. We approach the Parish Meeting as the necessary corollary of the Parish Communion; and we are not always very good at the technique of group discussion and action. There are points in the book which might reasonably lead us on to some friendly study of an effective Congregational church in our neighbourhood.

This would be precisely the sort of result that Mr Jenkins hopes for. His book is written in the context of the Ecumenical Movement, which compels us all to re-evaluate the traditions we have inherited. His purpose is both to "discover what light the ecumenical vision

and the experience of other churches throw on Congregationalism's understanding of itself and to interpret it to other churches"; and the book "will fail in its purpose if it does not stimulate members of other churches to undertake similar essays on behalf of their own denominations" (p. 15). I shall myself be most keenly on the look-out for the kind of "Restatement" of Anglicanism which I could honestly commend to a competent professional man contemplating giving up his job to prepare for Holy Orders or to the local Baptist minister with a "This is what the C. of E. is really like" and written with such honesty that they would believe it. And then I shall want the book about Methodism from which we could learn a good deal about what is to us the "problem" of "the use of the laity", and the Central Readers Board in particular pick up a few tips from the experience of local preachers.

DAVID M. PATON.

YARDLEY WOOD VICARAGE,
BIRMINGHAM.

PIO NONO. A STUDY IN EUROPEAN POLITICS AND RELIGION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By E. E. Y. Hales. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 25s.

It is strange that we have had to wait so long for an English study of the pontificate of Pius IX. Though some books about him were written in English in the last century, which Mr Hales does not even bother to mention in his bibliography, he is to be congratulated on having spotted and filled an obvious gap. While his study of Pio Nono does not bear comparison in regard either to range of interest or quality of writing with R. Aubert's *Le pontificat de Pie IX, 1846–1878* (1952), for those who do not read French it is a serviceable introduction to the story of the papacy during a very eventful period—the period of the Italian Risorgimento, of the Second Empire in France, and of the Vatican Council.

The time has not yet come when a definitive biography of Pius IX can be undertaken, since the papers at the Vatican belonging to this period remain inaccessible to historians; in particular the veil has not yet been lifted which conceals the influential but enigmatic personality of Cardinal Antonelli. As regards the character of Pio Nono himself, it may be wise to suspend judgment until all the facts are available. Meanwhile, Metternich's remark about him that he was "chaud de cœur . . . faible d'intelligence" does not seem to require much modification. Mr Hales endorses this remark at one point (p. 137), but on the whole he does his best to vindicate the pope's intelligence. His personal charm is obvious, and it comes out especially in his affection for his political oponents, e.g. Victor Emmanuel II. It is well illustrated by Mr Hales from correspondence that has lately been published.

He quotes (pp. 326 f.) Manning's enthusiastic prediction that "when the history of the Pontificate of Pius IX shall be written, it will be found to have been one of the most resplendent, majestic,

and powerful—one that has reached over the whole extent of the Church with greater power than that of any other Pope in the whole succession". There can be two opinions about the greatness of what Pius IX accomplished within the ecclesiastical institution over which he powerfully presided; but as a Christian statesman he was clearly a failure. Towards the end of his life he appears to have perceived this himself, witness this reflection of his (which Mr Hales does not quote): "Mon successeur devra s'inspirer de mon attachement à l'Eglise et de mon désir de faire le bien; quant au reste, tout a changé autour de moi; mon système et ma politique ont fait leur temps, mais je suis trop vieux pour changer d'orientation: ce sera l'œuvre de mon successeur" (see Aubert, op. cit., p. 498).

Mr Hales has a dramatic story to unfold, and he might have made more of it. It must also be said that despite his wide reading he cannot be altogether depended on for accuracy in detail. Here are some of the mistakes we have noted. It is false to say that "the immediate effect of the French Revolution and the rule of Napoleon had been only to give a further impetus to Gallican tendencies" (p. 41), for in certain respects the contrary was the case. What does Mr Hales mean by "the Concordat of 1815" (p. 42)? Lambruschini was no longer Papal Nuncio of Paris in November 1831 (p. 43). Mr Hales says Dupanloup was Bishop of Orleans in 1831 (p. 44), whereas he did not become so till 1849. The *Brief to the Bishop of Poland* was issued in June, not August, 1832 (p. 46). Mr Hales repeatedly (pp. 262, 284, 299) refers to the distinction between the thesis and the *antithesis* in regard to the relations of Church and State, when he means the *hypothesis*. "Archbishop Démoulins of Namur" is said (p. 266) to have invited Montalembert to the Congress of Malines in 1863, but according to our information *N.-J. Deheselle* was at that time *Bishop* of Namur, and the invitation came to Montalembert from M. Dechamps, a layman. Manning was never "an Anglican Dean" (p. 329).

The book contains some good illustrations and a useful bibliography. A. R. Vidler.

Stars Appearing. By Sibyl Harton. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.
The Steep Ascent of Heaven. By Gordon Huelin. S.P.C.K. 4s.

Hagiological literature may be compared to caviare—save that it is often unappreciated not by the vulgar but by the learned—the scholar, the historian, the theologian. Where factual truth is lacking the compiler must needs fall back upon legend, myth, and miracle, and often enough a really big miracle is more convincing (or at least more edifying) than a frank admission of lack of evidence. One has only to read certain passages in J. H. Newman to realize how strange and tortuous are the paths trodden by earnest seekers after signs and wonders. There is an instructive story somewhere of a Fellow of Balliol College in Jowett's time who spent his mornings concocting sayings, epigrams, and theses, which he falsely attributed to eminent

saints, doctors, and theologians of the church and tried them out on his colleagues after dinner. Moreover, the wider and more haphazard the collection in the calendar—as in our English Prayer Book—the more easy it is to fall into uncritical acceptance of legends dubious in origin and sometimes positively deleterious in effect. Mrs Harton has therefore gallantly essayed the impossible in undertaking to put flesh and blood upon the sixty-eight names in the Anglican Calendar. They range from obscure martyrs of the second century who are little more than names, through mighty doctors and teachers like Leo and Augustine to Anglo-Saxon bishops, kings, and confessors; the canvas is surely too vast for less than a lifetime's learning and no help is forthcoming should the student seek verification or ampler detail. The arrangement of the three sections seems elaborate without being helpful; why not take the calendar as it stands, so that if a reader on the morning of March 12 wants to learn about Gregory the Great he could turn straightway to that date and not need to consult the index to help him find Gregory following Leonard of Limoges (November 6) and preceding Boniface (June 5)? Or perhaps a straightforward chronological arrangement however approximate would at least have served as a substitute for a course in church history. Nor will the fastidious Anglican, nurtured in the prose of our best accredited divines, find it easy to stomach the somewhat breezy and jaunty and kaleidoscopic prose style in which these studies are told; it suits some saints but not all. In any future edition it would be as well to excise topical allusions which suggest the compiler dislikes the Welfare State: "To-day spinsters clamour for pensions at fifty-five" whereas Archbishop Theodore did not look forward to a Government pension at sixty-five; Richard of Chichester lived hard at Oxford before these latter days of easy State-grants to students; Benedict's Rule was "humane", not directed to make the world safe for one particular class of people. . . . Some readers might find such comments offensive or at least distracting and so overlook the fact that this compilation might serve more than one good end—the refreshment of memory and the provision of multitudinous facts over a wide range of learning and of innumerable biographical and local *trivia* not without value to the preacher or speaker. It is not so many years ago that an accredited speaker of a well-known women's association in the church showed herself none too clear in distinguishing Augustine of Hippo and Augustine of Canterbury—a confusion which, however, detracted not the slightest from the edificatory value of the address. Still, "knowledge edifieth" and this compilation might well be put on the list against the receipt of the next book-token.

Gordon Huelin's range is narrower and, granted the inevitable limitations of 100 pages, his picture gives a sense of composition and of variety in unity. Old facts are restated and some forgotten incidents recalled in plain unpretentious prose. The title seems strained and certainly inappropriate to cover such level-headed pedestrians as Bishop Hoadly and Parson Woodforde. There are a few misprints, but the general appearance and illustrations of this little volume

are quite admirable. It might well find a place on the divinity shelf of the form library or serve for semi-devotional reading by the housemistress to her flock between supper and bed.

W. G. Addison.

Britford.

The School as a Christian Community. Edited by W. O. Lester Smith. S.C.M. Press. 4s. 6d.

This book is published as the result of the meetings of a small group of educationalists who were asked by the Christian Frontier Council to consider "whether there was anything they could usefully say from a Christian standpoint about the fundamental assumptions in our national educational enterprise". Evidence was collected from a number of headmasters and headmistresses of secondary day schools on the methods by which their pupils are confronted with Christian truths and values within their various schools, and the chapters of this symposium have been written by eight of these witnesses, representing different localities and types of school. Even so, these contributions represent only a small section of our educational system and, as the editor truly remarks, the reader hesitates to generalize.

One fact does, however, stand out in all these accounts: while there is no guarantee that either heads of schools or their teaching staffs will be convinced Christians, the prevailing aims of our State educational system are directed by a Christian philosophy of life. In 1944 religious instruction and collective daily worship were enforced by legislation in all State schools, and at that time the Government's decision to introduce compulsion for what had long been a general practice was regarded by the teachers' organizations as both humiliating and unnecessary. In reality, as one contributor remarks, "we cannot make boys and girls into Christians by an Act of Parliament", and how far Christian values are accepted in a school community must in the first instance depend on the influence of the individual teachers. In this context, the Christian reader of this book will, I think, be left with a feeling of optimism. In the accounts of various methods, mostly familiar to all teachers, by which school-children may be trained to think in terms of service, self-sacrifice, fellowship, and respect for the individual, there is ample evidence that these Christian values are implicit in our national educational enterprise.

The operative question with which these writers are faced is whether they feel justified in describing their schools as Christian communities. Their answers are various and some are uncertain, but the majority feel with William Temple that "what a school can accomplish is very little unless it is working in alliance with the stronger influences of the home and society at large". In fact, their own evidence shows that, whatever doubts parents may have, our society still wishes its children to have a grounding in the principles of the Christian faith and the schools are expected to give it. How far, in this situation, the schools are likely to assist the return to a

general belief in Christian truths is a matter to be considered after reading these essays. It must largely depend on the way in which the schools help our future intellectual leaders to meet the materialistic challenge of the time. Here, in their sixth forms, the grammar schools, especially, have a unique opportunity, but this book does not give assurance that it is or always can be fully grasped.

WOKING. D. J. PEARCE.

THE CHOSEN PEOPLE, OR THE BIBLE, CHRISTIANITY AND RACE. By G. W. Broomfield. Longmans. 4s.

Amongst the challenging questions which were sent by the second Assembly of the World Council of Churches from Evanston to the participating churches and their congregations was this: "Is your Church willing to declare, as this Assembly has declared, that segregation and discrimination on the ground of race is contrary to the will of God, and to act on that declaration?" To Churches which do not operate in the midst of the tensions represented by these words, the answer is probably an immediate and straightforward "Yes". But to those, in Africa in particular, where the conflicting pressures of European and Asian and African interests are felt by Christians no less than by non-Christians, the answer, if it is to be Yes, is not immediate or straightforward. Before it can become so, the members of the various churches must be convinced that racial discrimination is condemned not by Church assemblies however ecumenical, but by the Word of God. This is particularly the case with those who belong to "revived" churches, and also largely true of the number of British settlers who will accept truth if they see it in the Bible, but not the same truths preached at them by ecclesiastics. For this reason we welcome Dr Broomfield's book as being a clear and concise summary of what the Bible has to say on the subject, illustrated from his wide experience in those parts of Central Africa where there is more chance of working out the problem according to this revelation than appears to be the case further south.

There is however one aspect of this problem which has yet to be clarified more than even this excellent book achieves if Christian public opinion is going to support, for instance in Kenya, the prospect of multi-racialism. Almost all Churches admit that in Christ, within the Body of Christ, we are all one, and there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free. What is not so clear to many, and among them some fine Christians, is that it is clearly the will of God that what is true within the Church is to be worked out outside it in the world of politics and social life.

There is also a serious danger involved in stating that multi-racialism is clearly the will of God, namely that in the interests of not offending those of other religions (i.e. Hindus and Moslems) we shall find a multi-racial government less keen on supporting the cause of Christian Missions. The Church may be torn between trying to maintain the present happy liaison between Church and State (such as exists in Kenya), and the sacrifice of governmental support

for Missions which at the moment could hardly be greater in Kenya, where a frankly Christian answer to Mau Mau is being sought by the majority of thinking people, and the Church has seldom faced a greater opportunity for expansion, even though it be over the ruins of the last few years. We feel sure that Dr Broomfield could give us some helpful guidance on this urgent problem along the lines of his present volume, for even though it may not be easily solved, it must not be brushed aside. Some day it must be made clear if our Colonial policy is to continue to support Christianity, and let other religions benefit where they can, or if we are to lose that support in the hopes of gaining the loyalty of those who do not share the faith of our fathers. What exactly is the Bible answer to this one? That is the only answer as Christians we should be interested in.

The Provost's Lodge, Nairobi. H. A. Evan Hopkins.

SHORTER NOTICES

Léon Bloy, by Rayner Heppenstall; Mauriac, by M. Jarrett-Kerr; André Gide, by Enid Starkie. (Studies in Modern European Literature and Thought.) Bowes and Bowes. 6s. each.

These three slim and attractive volumes are worthy additions to a series which has already established its reputation for excellence of style and for originality and authority of treatment. The three French writers concerned are of widely different type: Bloy violent and aggressive; Mauriac polished, subtly exploring the problems of grace and sin; Gide tortuously in search of truth. Each has received appropriate and suggestive handling in a brief study as unlike either of the others as the subjects themselves. If, at first flush, Mr Heppenstall's account appears to be as revealing of him as of Bloy, it soon becomes clear that the racy narrative of the effects successively produced on the Englishman by the Frenchman is effectively building up a dynamic appraisal of a dynamic personality. Fr Jarrett-Kerr's treatment of Mauriac is cooler, more analytic, without thereby losing either freshness of impression or readability. Dr Enid Starkie's essay follows the evolution of Gide with an affectionately critical eye; she admires him as a writer and she liked him as a man without being blind to his weaknesses. Not one of these studies, each of which successfully blends biography with criticism, is in any sense a mere encomium; indeed, I have the curious feeling that all of these distinguished Frenchmen emerge somewhat diminished in stature, though thereby more approachable, from the process. In the long run Heppenstall turns away from Bloy (not the first Bloy enthusiast I have known to "grow out of" him and his explosive mixture of undisciplined Catholicism and hatred of the bourgeoisie), though not without a lurking feeling that he is not finished with for good. The religious problems presented by Mauriac's novels are different; they are skilfully examined by Fr Jarrett-Kerr and any temptation

that the reader might have to regard Mauriac's views and solutions as in any way authoritative, theologically speaking, is dispelled, while his merits as a writer are clearly assessed. Both of these books will be of particular interest to those who seek to understand the striking development of the Catholic revival in the realm of the French novel: Bloy started it with what his critic calls bad novels, while Mauriac must be accounted its most distinguished and successful exponent. Gide presents the picture of an admirable stylist constantly preoccupied with the tortured and the distressed, continually developing and moving, from puritanical Protestantism to the borders of Catholicism, into and out of Communism, hovering over and across the bounds of Christianity, revolting the orthodox with his appearance of sensuality, his defence of homosexuality, his endless dragging of his questions and the answers he found for them before ever-renewed tribunals of self-interrogation and doubt, but, through it all exhibiting a mind of great sincerity and sensitivity which explores human experience with humility and expresses itself in exquisite French. This and more complexity emerges with clarity from Dr Starkie's sympathetic study.

In all three books religious and spiritual problems arise which are treated with respect, but it is not surprising that these should be handled with the greatest skill and authority in the work on Mauriac. All three reveal the men as well as the writers; all three show the persistence in French literature of the "moralist" who lurks beneath the novelist; all three are, in their different ways, masterly and eminently readable and they exact no knowledge of French for their enjoyment.

H. W. Lawton.

Sheffield.

The Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ. By Pierre Barbet. Clonmore and Reynolds. 16s.

The author, a surgeon of distinction, uses his professional knowledge to show the unreflecting layman how much more terrible were our Lord's physical sufferings than anything he could imagine. But were they worse than a Belsen? Does contemplation of the details increase one's faith or adoration? His survey of the history and technique of crucifixion is interesting, but the whole end of his theorizing and study is to support the validity of a relic, the Holy Shroud of Turin. The author is a devout medievalist whose faith can remove mountains which would deter many of his colleagues from reaching the same conclusions.

He correlates to his own satisfaction the traumata which the buffeting, scourging, and crucifixion might have caused our Lord's body with the form and position of alleged bloodstains and their relationship to a mystreious imprint of the sacred Body on the Shroud. No forensic expert would accept this without scientific test, which the author (with relief?) has been unable to obtain.

From a study of large-scale photographs of the shroud he en-

deavours to show how the bloodstains were caused, but from the small though excellent photographs at the end of the book I do not find his arguments very convincing. One might as soon assume a diagnosis from study of an X-ray plate without clinical examination of the patient.

The author refrains from wondering that the shroud, a piece of fine linen 13 ft long. should have survived virtually intact the ravages of moth, fire, rapine, and the other vicissitudes for close on 2,000 years. Nor does he find it strange that the relic only came to light at the beginning of the thirteenth century. "It is impossible to believe", he writes, "that they did not preserve with the greatest care this relic of God made Man. One is also led to think that they would have been careful to hide it." It is possible to believe that in the light of their Saviour's Resurrection appearances the disciples chose to ignore such reminders of his sufferings and death.

W. H. G. Reed.

Iron Acton.

Tolstoy: A Life of my Father. By Alexandra Tolstoy. Gollancz. 30s.

This vast biography is the work of Tolstoy's youngest daughter, who in his last years was closer to him than almost anyone else. It is a far more detailed study than her earlier *Tragedy of Tolstoy* and in it she tries to be more fair to her mother. She draws richly on the diaries and letters of both her parents and quotes copiously from Tolstoy's writings. She succeeds in painting a vivid portrait of this remarkably complex and many-sided man, his relations with other writers and with his family. The landlord and the emancipator, the pacifist and the internationalist, who drew the attention of the world to his country estate is brought before us. Not least interesting is the consideration of his very revolutionary ideas of education. A lonely man, a gigantic man, the inspirer of Gandhi, the herald of a revolution which he could not bless nor desire in its violent form, the Christian perfectionist to whom the Church refused to grant Christian burial, the perennial nonconformist—here he is—and with all this a puzzled, unhappy man who made a good death and is not likely soon to be forgotten.

L. M. Schiff.

Love, Power and Justice. By Paul Tillich. Oxford University Press. 10s. 6d.

In these lectures delivered at the University of Nottingham Professor Tillich treats three very large subjects, fundamental in the mutual relations of human beings, of social groups, and of man and God. By a serious attempt to penetrate their inner meaning and to cut out all shallow and sentimental use of these central phrases, he ends by restating them in a way most important for both ethics and theology. Anything that Professor Tillich writes is of the greatest

interest, as he is undoubtedly one of the most seminal thinkers of our time. Might one be allowed to express the opinion that he would lose nothing of profundity and gain much clarity were he able to shed the excessively Teutonic method of utterance and usage of words which make him so hard to read unless one is a spcialist?

L. M. SCHIFF.

PERSONAL RELIGION AMONG THE GREEKS. By André-Jean Festugière, O.P. C.U.P. for University of California Press. 28s.

THE SOPHISTS. By Mario Untersteiner; translated from the Italian by Kathleen Freeman. Blackwell. 31s. 6d.

The eight chapters of *Personal Religion among the Greeks* comprise the Sathers Classical Lectures given at the University of California, Berkeley, in 1952. Fr Festugière starts by distinguishing between traditional religion, i.e. popular devotion mainly devoted towards national gods, and inner devotion to God, peculiar to the individual. He traces the latter through classical times to the Hellenistic era, in which he sees as the mark of the educated and religious pagan the desire for union with a cosmic God, arising from Plato's having made contemplation of the world the supreme object of wisdom. There is an extremely interesting chapter on "The inclination to retirement", which includes a brief discussion of the Christian anchorites, and detailed accounts of two examples of popular piety, as evinced in Lucius' devotion to Isis and Aelius Aristides' to Asclepius. The last two chapters, entitled "Reflective Piety", deal under the sub-title "Man and the World" with Stoicism and its affinities with both Plato and Christianity, and under the sub-title "The Contemplation of God" with the mysticism of the Hermetic Corpus and the Neo-Platonists.

A book covering such a vast span must necessarily consist of summary generalizations rather than detailed discussion, but it is well documented, with many references to authors both ancient and modern. In the original lectures quotations were naturally given in translation, but it is a pity that the Greek is not more often given in the notes, particularly in quotations from Aeschylus, where the text is so often doubtful. In the notes on Chapter III the omission of note 8 has led to a dislocation of the notes following. The specialist will value this book for its breadth of scholarship and judgment; the reader who has little classical background will find it vivid and stimulating.

The Sophists does not present a study of the Sophistic movement in general, but concentrates on the analysis of the philosophical ideas of the more outstanding sophists, while indicating their relationship to trends in the fields of literature and philosophy. On occasion the author brings forward evidence not hitherto used; it may surprise many readers to find e.g. that Thuc. iii, 84 represents substantially the thought of Hippias of Elis. His reinterpretation of the sophistic fragments is most painstaking and highly ingenious, perhaps too much so. In his opinion the *μέτρον ἄνθρωπος* dictum of

Protagoras should be translated "Man is the master of all experiences in regard to the 'phenomenality' of what is real and the 'non-phenomenality' of what is not real"—a translation which departs considerably from the generally accepted interpretation of *μέτρον*. In the case of Gorgias, one feels that he may have read too much into the *Helen* and the *Palamedes*. Generally, the author depicts the Sophists as men of highly original and subtle minds, to such an extent that one finds it difficult to account for their extensive popularity, or for the unflattering portrayal of them as a class in e.g. Plato's *Sophist*. The book, which is excellently documented, is one that will stimulate thought even where it does not compel assent.

University of Nottingham. Molly Whittaker.

Alexandrian Christianity. Edited by Henry Chadwick and J. E. L. Oulton.

Nature and Grace. Edited by A. M. Fairweather. The Library of Christian Classics. 30s. each.

We become more and more enthusiastic about this "Library" as the successive volumes appear. *Alexandrian Christianity* contains selected translations of Clement and Origen with introductions and notes. Clement is represented by the Third and Seventh Books of the *Stromateis* ("On Marriage" and "On Spiritual Perfection"); Origen by the treatise "On Prayer", the "Exhortation to Martyrdom", and the recently discovered "Dialogue with Heraclides".

Nature and Grace consists of selections from the *Summa Theologica* of St Thomas Aquinas. The following sections are included: Prima Pars, Questions 1–4, 20–23; Prima Secundae, Questions 82, 85, 109–114; Secunda Secundae, Questions 1–7, 17–21, 23, 27.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

A.P.C.K. (Dublin): G. O. Simms, *The Bible in Perspective*; J. E. L. Oulton, *Confirmation*; Charles Walsh, *Why Sunday?*; M. F. Graham, *What happens after death?* (6d. each).

Abingdon Press (New York): Gerald Kennedy, *Who Speaks for God?* ($2.50).

Allen and Unwin: J. R. R. Tolkien, *The Fellowship of the Ring* (21s.).

Edgar Backus: Robert F. Wearmouth, *Methodism and the Struggle of the Working Classes 1850–1900* (21s.).

A. and C. Black: Robert H. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha* (25s.).

Blackfriars Publications: *Poverty* (15s.).

Blackwell: *Christian Living in Modern Society* (*The Modern Churchman Conference Number*) (5s.).

Bowes and Bowes: E. W. F. Tomlin, *Simone Weil* (6s.).

Church Historical Society (S.P.C.K.): H. F. Woodhouse, *The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology 1547–1603* (25s.).

Clonmore and Reynolds: P. H. Pollock, *Wings on the Cross* (12s. 6d.).

Desclée de Brouwer: L. Malevez, S. J., *Le message chrétien et le mythe: la théologie de Rudolf Bultmann* (80 Belgian francs).

Desclée et Cie: Dom Odon Lottin, *Morale Fondamentale* (n.p.).

EDINBURGH HOUSE PRESS: M. Stanley-Wrench, *The Splendid Burden* [a play] (5s.).

EPWORTH PRESS: Norman H. Snaith, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of 1 Kings, XVII–XIX and XXI–XXII* (10s. 6d.).

FABER AND FABER: Frithjof Schuon, *Spiritual Perspectives and Human Facts* (21s.).

FAITH PRESS: J. G. Davies, *The Spirit, the Church and the Sacraments* (12s. 6d.).

GROSVENOR PRESS (PORTSMOUTH): T. Grigg-Smith, *Church Teaching for Confirmation and After* (5s. 6d.).

HIGHWAY PRESS: Anthony Hanson, *The Meaning of Unity: a study of a biblical theme* (6s.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: S. J. Davies, *In Spite of Dungeons* (12s. 6d.); William Neil, *The Rediscovery of the Bible* (12s. 6d.); E. P. Dickie, *Thou are the Christ* [Devotional studies] (3s. 6d.).

HOLLIS AND CARTER: Philip Hughes, *The Reformation in England*, Vol. III (42s.).

IONA COMMUNITY PUBLISHING DEPARTMENT (GLASGOW): *Evangelism in Scotland* [a report prepared for the World Council of Churches] (2s. 3d., post free).

T. WERNER LAURIE: C. E. Last, *Man in the Universe* (10s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: Evelyn Underhill, *The School of Charity—Meditations on the Christian Creed; The Mystery of Sacrifice—A Meditation on the Liturgy* [a new edition of these two books in one volume] (7s. 6d.).

METHUENS: Dorothy L. Sayers, *Introductory Papers on Dante* (21s.).

MOWBRAY: C. J. Stranks, *Dean Hook* (9s. 6d.); Reginald Lumb, *The Church's Part in Education* [a revised edition of *Tomorrow's Teaching*, which was reviewed in THEOLOGY, June 1946, p. 185] (5s.); Richard Tatlock (Ed.), *The Only Hope of the World* [Light Programme broadcast talks by the Bishop of Croydon, Matthew McNarney, F. Townley Lord, and Tom Allan] (5s.); A Religious of C.S.M.V., *As in Adam—A Study in the Church* (6s.); D. Berners Wilson, *An Introduction to Belief* (2s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Herbert A. Musurillo, S.J., *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* (35s.).

GEORGE PHILIP AND SON: *New Scripture Atlas* (2s. 9d.).

SEMINARIO CONCILIAR DE BARCELONA: Isidro Gomá Civit, *Ubi Spiritus Dei, illic ecclesia et omnis gratia* (n.p.).

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: *A Bibliography for the Use of Teachers of Religious Knowledge* (2s. 6d.); Elsie Broadie, *The Chosen Nation—Book One: Founders and Leaders* (4s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: *Evanston Speaks* [Reports from the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches, 15–31 August 1954] (2s. 6d.); S. A. Morrison, *Middle East Survey* (12s. 6d.); Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Life Together* (4s. 6d.); A. M. Fairweather (Ed.), *Nature and Grace* (30s.); Mary B. Hesse, *Science and the Human Imagination* (12s. 6d.); D. S. Cairns, *The Faith that Rebels* [5th edition of this well-known book on the miracles of Jesus, with a foreword by the late Prof. Donald Baillie] (9s.).

SHEED AND WARD: Vincent Wilkin, S.J., *The Image of God in Sex* (6s.); Cecily Hastings and Donald Nicholl (Eds.), *Selection II* (15s.).

S.P.C.K.: *The Ecclesiastical Courts: Principles of Reconstruction* (15s. 6d.); John Betjeman, *Poems in the Porch* (2s.); W. P. Witcutt, *Return to Realtiy* (7s. 6d.); E. F. Braley (Ed.), *More Letters of Herbert Hensley Henson* (15s.); J. Stanley Leatherbarrow, *Victorian Period Piece* (17s. 6d.).

TYNDALE PRESS: E. K. Simpson, *The Pastoral Epistles* (15s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON